

REMARKS

The restriction requirement mailed June 2, 2003, has been carefully reviewed. This was received with much surprise, because the present application **was filed with only one claim**. Please see the original papers filed in the present application. Please also see the publication of the present application which shows that the present application was published with **only one claim**.

To explain how twenty-two (22) claims inadvertently and erroneously replaced the one claim originally filed, please note the "Notice to File Corrected Application Papers" mailed by the PTO on December 17, 2001. We responded to this notice on February 19, 2002, **by accidentally and erroneously filing a copy of the parent application which contained 22 claims**. This was an erroneous filing because, as noted above, the present application was filed with only one claim, and the 22 claims from the parent application were never intended to be filed. Undersigned apologizes for the erroneous filing of February 19, 2002, and the inconvenience caused.

By the amendment presented above, the claims 1-22 erroneously filed on February 19, 2002, have now been deleted and have been replaced by the one originally presented claim 1, renumbered as new claim 23.

In re of Appln. No. 09/998,639


As there can be no restriction requirement in view of the fact that there is only one claim pending, no election need be made, i.e. the presentation of this single claim in effect constitutes an election.

Applicants respectfully await the results of a first examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicants

By

  
Sheridan Neimark  
Registration No. 20,520

SN:jaa  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\K\Kanf\Hotta2A\pto\rePLY 12JE03.doc